UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/346,789	07/02/1999	FREDERICK E. NIEMI	112025-0125	2883

24267	7590	09/13/2004

CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER
BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Advisory Action</td><td>Application No.
09/346,789</td><td>Applicant(s)
NIEMI, FREDERICK E.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.</td><td>Art Unit
2126</td></tr>
</table>

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

    (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

    (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

        NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☒ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-21*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive. Applicant argues that Waldo fails to teach or suggest applicants claimed "in, response to receiving the registration service request at the process manager, generating and forwarding a notification message that identifies the new application or process to the network management station." The examiner disagrees. The argued limitation discloses in response to opening a new application or process, issuing a registration service request from the new application or process to a process manager. The examiner has equated the new application or process to a newly instantiated process or service that registers with a look up service, herein equated to be the process manager. Waldo teaches when a new service is created, the service registers itself with the lookup service, providing an initial collection of attributes (col. 6, lines 66 - col. 7, line 1). The registration is performed by calling a ServiceRegistrar interface of the lookup service (col. 8, lines 17-67). The service finds the lookup service by querying a discovery server for the location of the lookup service. Further, the lookup service provides an event mechanism that generates notifications as new services are registered, existing services are deleted, or attributes of a service are modified. To use the event mechanism, a client registers to be notified upon the occurrence of a particular event, and when the event occurs, the lookup service notifies the client (col. 7, lines 11-19). Therefore, the Examiner believes Waldo teaches in response to opening a new application or process (instantiating a new service), issuing a registration service request from the new application or process to a process manager (via registering the service with the lookup service). Applicant states that the notifications described in Waldo are not the same as the notification message claimed by Applicant. In response, the examiner would like to point out that the claims only detail that a notification message is sent. Therefore, as long as a message notifiying the client of some information is sent the limitation is met. Applicant argues that the notification involves a callback routine that is invoked when the lookup service is updated and that this is not the same as Applicant's claimed generating and forwarding a notification message. The examiner disagrees. The cited claim text details in response to receiving the registration service request at the process manager, generating and forwarding a notification message that identifies the new application or process to the network management station. The claims do not set forth any limitation of accomplishing the generating and forwarding of the notification message. Therefore, any way of generating and forwarding a notification message to a network management station of a new application or process would meet the limitation of the claims as disclosed. Waldo performs this limitation by executing a registered callback routine that upon executing this routine sends a notification message to the to the clients of the occurrence of an event such as the adding of a new service to the lookup service. Therefore, the limitations are met as disclosed in the claims. Applicant then argues that Waldo fails to make clear whether a notification message that identifies the new service is used to invoke the callback routine and pass registered objects to notify the client, rather, Waldo is silent as to how the callback routine is actually invoked and the objects that are actually passed to the client. The examiner disagrees. Waldo explicitly teaches that clients register to receive notifications of new services in order for them to use the new services as soon as they are added to the lookup service (col. 2, lines 60-62) by sending a callaback routine wherein the lookup service invokes the callback routine to notify the client of the updated service (col. 7, lines 11-19; col. 11, line 36 - col. 12, line 18). An example of the operation includes if a service that the client was using has become unavailable, upon receiving the event, the client may store information so that it no longer uses the service (col. 11, lines 49-51). Therefore, in order for the clients to have immediate access to the new services they must receive a notification message that identifies the service in order to access the service. Therefore, the rejections are maintained as disclosed in the final rejection.

Applicant argues that the cited combination does not teach generating and issuing a registration service request upon opening an application or process. The examiner disagrees. Joyce teaches when a monitorable process enters a Jipc system or is created, it is automatically included in any monitoring session active on its host machine by generating and sending a monitorable event and displaying the event on the consoles. The examiner states that Joyce does not explicitly mention that the monitorable event is not sent over a network, i.e. there does not exist a network communication facility that sends the event from the process to the console. The examiner used the teachings of Bonnell in teach that a process that is monitored on on system sends messages / information over a network to a console for handling. Therefore based on the combination the event is sent from a remote system to the console for display. Therefore, the examiner believes that the combination teach the cited limitations as disclosed. Applicant argues that Joyce fails to provide for Applicant's registration service requests that are generated or issued upon a creating creating a process or entering a process into a Jipc system. The examiner disagrees. The cited claims detail the application or process generates and issues a registration request upon opening of the application or process onto the workstation wherein the process manager generates and forwards a notification message that identifies the new application or process to the user interface application in response to receiving the registration request. Hence, each time a new application or process is created a registration message is sent wherein the process manager sends a notification message to the monioring station thereafter. Joyce teaches that when an event is about to occur in a monitorable process, monitoring information is conveyed to a channel wherein the event cannot occur until the channel replies (pg. 129). Monitorable events are sent whenever any JIPC initiates or completes operation of one of the following operations: entering or leaving a Jipc system, creating or killing a process, searching for another process to acquire its process identifier, and message sends, forwards, receives, and replies (pg. 128). Therefore, whenever a process initiates entering a system or creating a process, a monitorable event is sent and must be handle by the controller or channel wherein the event cannot occur until the channel replies. Hence, when a process wants to enter a system or create a process, or send a message to another process, it must send a message (registration event) to the channel and based on its response can proceed accordingly. Therefore, the process must register with the channel in order to enter the system, or send a message to another process. The examiner believes the cited combination teach the limitation as disclosed and maintains the rejection. Therefore, since all the limitations of the claims are met by the rejections disclosed in the final rejection the rejections are sustained.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY